



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,511	06/29/2001	Ted Liang	042390P11354	8234

7590 06/23/2005

Michael A. Bernadicou
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

ZERVIGON, RUDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1763

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/895,511

Applicant(s)

LIANG ET AL.

Examiner

Rudy Zervigon

Art Unit

1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-12 and 18-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-12 and 18-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/21/2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 18, 2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 1, 4-12, 18, 20, 25, and 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casey, Jr. et al (USPat. 6,042,738) as demonstrated by Baum, Aaron Wolf et al (US 5,684,360 A) in view of Hashimoto, Hiroyuki (US 6,420,701 B1).

Casey teaches an apparatus (Figure 1) including:

- i. A holder (26) to mount a substrate / mask (30) in a chamber (22) by a stage (24) – Regarding the particular identity of the article to be processed, it is well established that apparatus claims must be structurally distinguished from the prior art (In re Danley, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959). "Apparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does ." (emphasis in original) Hewlett - Packard Co . v. Bausch & Lomb Inc ., 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990), MPEP – 2114). Further, a claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the

Art Unit: 1763

prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. *Exparte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987).

- ii. A stage (24) adapted to position the holder in a chamber (22), and adapted to move in different directions (column 4, line 64 – column 5, line 3)
- iii. A pumping system (“vacuum chamber 22”; column 4, lines 31) adapted to evacuate the chamber
- iv. A first electron column¹ (28; Figure 1; column 3, lines 8-16, “image and mill the workpiece”; column 4, lines 5-10; column 5, lines 5-10) imaging system (54; column 4, lines 38-45; column 5, lines 5-10) adapted to locate (column 6, lines 17-30) an opaque defect (abstract; column 1, lines 5-10; column 2, lines 28-50; column 8, line 62 – column 9, line 2;) in the substrate / mask
- v. A gas delivery system (45, 34; column 5, lines 22-38) adapted to dispense a reactant gas towards the defect
- vi. A second electron column¹ delivery system (32; column 4, line 64 – column 5, line 12) adapted to direct electrons towards the opaque defect (column 3, lines 60-65) to induce chemical etching by the reactant gas and said electrons to induce said gas to etch said opaque defect without ion “bombardment, and without ion implantation or knock-on of atoms” – “methods of gas-assisted etching using an etching gas including bromine” (abstract). It is noted that when the structure recited in the reference is substantially identical to that of the claims, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent (In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977); MPEP 2112.01).

Art Unit: 1763

- vii. DUV/EUV mask / substrate (column 1, lines 35-45)
- viii. Chrome opaque defect (column 3, lines 3-4; line 55)
- ix. An ion focusing control system (18; column 4, lines 28-44) and scanning control system (62, column 4, lines 39-43)
- x. An acceleration system ("JEOL Model 6400") providing a low acceleration voltage (column 9, lines 20-25)
- xi. A computer controller (50, column 4, lines 38-45; column 7, lines 33-44) adapted to control the electron delivery system
- xii. The gas delivery system (34; column 5, lines 22-38) is also adapted to "dispense a carrier gas towards said opaque defect", "said gas comprises water or oxygen" (claim 29), "said gas comprises Xenon Fluoride (XeF₂)" (claim 30) – Applicant's claim 18, 29, 30 limitations are intended use claim requirements. Further, it has been held that claim language that simply specifies an intended use or field of use for the invention generally will not limit the scope of a claim (Walter , 618 F.2d at 769, 205 USPQ at 409; MPEP 2106). Additionally, in apparatus claims, intended use must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim (In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto , 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963); MPEP2111.02).
- xiii. Applicant's claim 20 limitation of "the reactant gas absorbs to said opaque defect and becomes disassociated" are intended use claim requirements. Further, it has been held

¹ Baum, Aaron Wolf et al (US 5,684,360 A) teaches the art-accepted definition of "electron beam column" (column

Art Unit: 1763

that claim language that simply specifies an intended use or field of use for the invention generally will not limit the scope of a claim (Walter , 618 F.2d at 769, 205 USPQ at 409; MPEP 2106). Additionally, in apparatus claims, intended use must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim (In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto , 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963); MPEP 2111.02).

Casey does not teach that Casey's first electron column (28; Figure 1; column 3, lines 8-16, "image and mill the workpiece"; column 4, lines 5-10; column 5, lines 5-10) is used to direct a first set of electrons towards a substrate.

Hashimoto teaches an electron column (12; Figure 6; column 11, lines 58-67) used to direct a first set of electrons towards a substrate (15; Figure 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Hashimoto's electron column to Casey's apparatus and to optimize the operation of Casey's apparatus to avoid damaging underlying layers of the processed substrate.

Motivation to add Hashimoto's electron column to Casey's apparatus and to optimize the operation of Casey's apparatus to avoid damaging underlying layers of the processed substrate is for locating and processing specific regions of the substrate as taught by Hashimoto (column 7, lines 1-10), and to minimize substrate damage as taught by Casey (column 9; lines 65-67). Further, it is well established that the duplication of parts is obvious (In re Harza , 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960) MPEP 2144.04). It would be obvious to those of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 1763

the art to optimize the operation of the claimed invention (In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980); In re Hoeschele, 406 F.2d 1403, 160 USPQ 809 (CCPA 1969); Merck & Co. Inc. v. Biocraft Laboratories Inc., 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 975 (1989); In re Kulling, 897 F.2d 1147, 14 USPQ2d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 1990), MPEP 2144.05).

4. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casey, Jr. et al (USPat. 6,042,738) as demonstrated by Baum, Aaron Wolf et al (US 5,684,360 A) in view of Hashimoto, Hiroyuki (US 6,420,701 B1) and Fuji, Eiji et al (US 5,876,504 A). Casey and Hashimoto are discussed above. Casey and Hashimoto do not teach the angle of gas injection of Casey's gas delivery system (45, 34; column 5, lines 22-38) has an angular dispersion of 5-25°. Fuji teaches a variably positioned gas injection nozzle (8; Figure 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace Casey and Hashimoto's gas injector nozzle with Fuji's variably positioned gas injection nozzle (8; Figure 2).

Motivation to replace Casey and Hashimoto's gas injector nozzle with Fuji's variably positioned gas injection nozzle (8; Figure 2) is for establishing laminar flow on the substrate as taught by Fuji (column 4, lines 35-40).

5. Claims 21-24, 26, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casey, Jr. et al (USPat. 6,042,738) as demonstrated by Baum, Aaron Wolf et al (US 5,684,360 A) in view of Hashimoto, Hiroyuki (US 6,420,701 B1). Casey and Hashimoto are discussed above. Casey does not teach operating pressures in 0.5-10.0mTorr, "a beam comprising a current of about 0.05-1.0nA", second electrons beams with diameters of about 5-

Art Unit: 1763

125nm and energies of 0.-3.0keV. Casey further does not teach that his reactor is either reaction-limited or mass transfer limited as claimed by Applicant's claim 33 – However, when the structure recited in the reference is substantially identical to that of the claims, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent (In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977); MPEP 2112.01).

Hashimoto further teaches an electron beam apparatus (Figure 7) including operating pressures up to 100picoTorr (column 6, lines 15-20), beam currents of about 1.0nA (column 7, lines 1-10), electrons beams with diameters of about 5-125nm (“not more than 1 micrometer”; column 7, lines 1-10) and energies of 3.0keV (column 7, lines 23-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace Casey's electron emitting column with Hashimoto's electron emitting column (12; Figure 7).

Motivation to replace Casey's electron emitting column with Hashimoto's electron emitting column (12; Figure 7) is for thin film processing as taught by Hashimoto (column 6, lines 30-41).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 25, 31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

7. Applicant states:

“

Furthermore, Applicants wish to point out to the Examiner that reflected electrons are not the same as secondary electrons. Hashimoto may teach spectroscopic analysis of reflected electrons, but Hashimoto fails to teach imaging of secondary electrons.

Art Unit: 1763

“

The Examiner disagrees. If Applicant certifies that Hashimoto does teach spectroscopic analysis of electrons, reflected or secondary, then the Examiner believes Hashimoto's apparatus can perform the intended use. If Applicant's believe otherwise, the Examiner would then solicit Applicant's to submit evidence to the contrary. Specifically, that, per Applicant's belief, Hashimoto's apparatus cannot image “secondary electrons” when it is asserted that Hashimoto's apparatus can image “reflected electrons”. Further, when the structure recited in the reference is substantially identical to that of the claims, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent (*In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977); MPEP 2112.01).

8. The remainder of Applicant's arguments are centered on Applicant's claim amendments. In response, the Examiner directs Applicant to the above new grounds of rejection as necessitated by the claim amendments.

Art Unit: 1763

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Rudy Zervigon whose telephone number is (571) 272.1442. The examiner can normally be reached on a Monday through Thursday schedule from 8am through 7pm. The official fax phone number for the 1763 art unit is (703) 872-9306. Any Inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Chemical and Materials Engineering art unit receptionist at (571) 272-1700. If the examiner can not be reached please contact the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh, at (571) 272-1435.


6/22/5